

REMARKS

Applicant would like thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the interviews on August 27 and 28, 2008. As discussed during the interview, Applicant requests reconsideration of independent Claims 1 and 9, and the claims depending therefrom, in view of the Amendments and Remarks set forth herein, which Applicant considers to be a summary of the matters discussed during the interview as required by 37 CFR § 1.133(b).

The Rejections Under § 102(b) and § 103(a) Should be Withdrawn

The Office Action rejected Claims 9-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,411,347 to Bowmer ("Bowmer"). The Office Action rejected Claims 1-4, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,056,911 to Tani ("Tani"). The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Bowmer in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,561,185 to Finsterwalder ("Finsterwalder").

As discussed during the interviews, Bowmer discloses that the sleeve **10** is provided with internal taper threads **20** and **21**, which match the taper threads **16** and **17** of the bars **12** and **14**. threads. In contrast, as illustrated in Figures 1, 2 and 4 of the present invention and as discussed during the interview, the traverse threads **24** of the present invention have approximately the same diameter along the entire length of the bar. This is advantageous since the present invention eliminates the necessity of forming a tapered end and, thereafter, forming threads on the tapered end.

It was also discussed during the interview that Tani does not disclose that the longitudinal ribs intersect the traverse ribs, as disclosed in the present application, but instead discloses that the longitudinal ribs are formed "between" the traverse ribs. Tani also discloses that the radius of the longitudinal ribs is the same as the radius of the core of the bar (see Figure 7) and, thus, the longitudinal ribs of the '911 patent provides less reinforcement than the longitudinal rib of the present invention, which has a radius greater than the core. It was also discussed that Tani does not disclose that the longitudinal rib is interrupted adjacent at least one end of the bar as it is unnecessary to interrupt the longitudinal rib since it does not obstruct the threads defined by the traverse ribs.

It was further discussed during the interview that Finsterwalder does not disclose a longitudinal rib.

As discussed during the interview, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1 and 9 to further emphasize these distinctions. Specifically, Applicant has amended independent Claim 1 to clarify that the distance between the central axis of the core and the outer surface of each longitudinally extending rib is greater than the largest distance between the central axis of the core and the outer surface of the core. Applicant has amended independent Claim 9 to clarify that the radius of the at least one transversely extending rib is substantially the same along the length of the bar and that the internally threaded member has an internal thread having a substantially constant diameter sized to receive the transverse ribs so that the internally threaded member can be threaded onto said pattern of threads defined by the at least one transversely extending rib. As discussed during the interview, the term "substantial" is intended to connote that that the radius of the at least one transversely extending rib and the diameter of the internal thread do not vary except for the minor variations that may be caused during manufacturing. Applicant submits that independent Claims 1 and 9, and the claims depending therefrom, as clarified by the above-referenced amendments, include recitations which patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments to the application and the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims of the present application are in condition for immediate allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued. Examiner Gilbert is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required

Appl. No.: 10/720,473
Amdt. Dated: August 28, 2008
Reply to Office Action of May 29, 2008
Page 8 of 8

therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 13-4365.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "H. B. Ward III", written over a horizontal line.

Henry B. Ward, III
Registration No. 42,212

Customer No. 24239
MOORE & VAN ALLEN PLLC
430 Davis Drive, Suite 500
Post Office Box 13706
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
Phone: 707-331-1027
Fax: 704-339-5800

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON August 28, 2008.

CHAR2\1068144v1